DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 641 EA 012 549

AUTHOR Drahmann, Theodore R.
TITLE Public and Private Schools: Collaboration, Co-Existence, or Conflict?
PUB DATE 16 Feb 80
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators (112th, Anaheim, CA, February 15-18, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Boards of Education; Catholic Schools; Dual Enrollment; *Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Government School Relationship; *Institutional Cooperation; *Private Education; Private School Aid; Private Schools; *Public Education; Public Schools; School Organization; State Federal Aid; Student Characteristics

ABSTRACT

The characteristics of private elementary and secondary education briefly described include enrollment patterns, school organization, the status of boards of education in private schools, the financing structure, and the population they service. Areas of collaboration between public and private education exist in shared time arrangements, provision for busing nonpublic school students, and participation of private school children in programs of government financed services and materials. Areas of coexistence in which both systems of schools pursue their ways separately are curriculum and school funding. However, in areas of coexistence there are also areas of competition such as enrollment and finances. The strongest area of competition is that for government funds. The viewpoints of opposing sides are summarized. In the final section of the speech, suggestions are made for ways public and private school educators can increase cooperation, smooth out coexistence, and decrease competition. (MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED185641

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AASA 112th ANNUAL CONVENTION

February 15-18, 1980

Anaheim, California

Speaker: Brother Theodore R. Drahmann

Session: Public and Private Schools - Conflict, Co-existence, or Collaboration?

Date: Saturday, February 16

Time: 4:00 p.m.

Program Page # 62

EA 012 549

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Drahmann

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AASA CONVENTION

February, 1980

Brother Theodore Drahmann, FSC

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS: COLLABORATION, CO-EXISTENCE, OR CONFLICT?

It is said that, at a dinner where public and private school educators had gathered, a toast was proposed by the public school superintendent at the end of the meal. "To our public schools," he said, "where the situation is always serious but never desperate!" To which, the private school administrator replied, "To our private schools, where the situation is always desperate but really not serious!"

This incident, recounted of an affair several years ago, reflected a time when we in private education had only, it seemed, a sense of humor to fall back on. This was time when costs were soaring, enrollments were plummeting, members of religious orders by the thousands were leaving teaching positions, and there was only gloom and doom to be seen and heard. Thankfully, I can report that the situation is much more stable and hopeful at the present time in the nonpublic grade and high schools of the land, and I can only surmise that it is the public school administrators who may be the more disheartened of the two groups. Perhaps I am wrong - we may all be desperate!

Although I speak as a part of the private school community, I must report that my background in education is of a hybrid variety. I attended a parochial grade school and a public high school in the small Minnesota town from which I spring. My father was a long-time public school board chairman, and his lengthy tenure in office was only ended when a coalition of Polish Catholics and German Lutherans managed to elect their candidates at the expense of my father, who unofficially represented the German

Catholics of the area. Memories of my growing years are filled with recollections of supper table conversation dealing with public school matters.

But my public school contacts are not limited to my childhood. Among other experiences, I served on the governor's committee to plan Minnesota education for the 70's (things did not all turn out as we planned, but I see several areas in which they did, for which our group can share the credit). Most recently, I was a member for the past two years of the Resolutions Committee of this organization, a result of the concern shown by AASA leadership in recent years that minority groups in American education (of which nonpublic educators are one) would be represented. That was an enlightening and fascinating experience.

I am also a Christian Brother, a group famous most generally as the makers of fine wine and brandy, but really founded as a community of Catholic educators and continuing as such throughout the world. In my career as a Brother, I was a principal of Catholic high schools in Chicago and St. Paul, and superintendent of the Catholic school system in the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area.

II.

To cover the topic listed for this session, I propose a simple route. I would like to begin with a brief description of private elementary and secondary education as it exists in this nation at the present time. Then I would try to lay out areas of collaboration - when can we be "in each other's arms?" - areas of co-existence where we each may peacefully go our own way, and finally - gingerly and delicately - lay out where there seem to be "dog-eat-dog" competitive relationships, regrettable as that may be.

III.

What is private education like in the United States today? I believe that it would help to know the size and composition of the school system in the private sector at the present time:

18% of American schools are private,
10% of American students are in private schools,
10% of high school graduates come from private schools.

These figures indicate that private schools tend to be smaller than their public school counterparts.

Further: only 6% of educational expenditures are made by private schools, since these schools have a lower per pupil cost. They also employ 11% of the teachers in American schools, a fact indicating that the pupil-teacher ratio is apt to be slightly less than in public schools. Currently, the national ratio for private elementary and secondary schools stands at 18.5.

What about Catholic schools, who often are the "villains" in discussion of public-private relations, as well as in matters concerning aid to the private parents and child? Catholic schools number 50% of the private schools in America, and enroll two-thirds of the private school pupils. Obviously, Catholic schools tend to be larger than other private schools. They have 50% of the teachers and a ratio of 22.8 nationally, again putting them higher in this regard than other private schools. Catholic schools spent 45% of the money spent on private education, indicating that they have lower costs than their other private colleagues.

Is there an enrollment shift in the private schools which corresponds to the current decline in public education? From 1976 to 1978 (October 1 of each year), while public education enrollment declined by 4%, private school attendance fell by 2%. During this same two-year

time period, the percentage of children in private schools rose .2%, while the percentage of all American children who attend public schools was lowered by.3%. This indicates a slight shift in these two years in the attendance patterns of American children.

As far as totals are concerned, in 1978-79, slightly more than five million children attended private grade and high schools and about 42,500,000 were in our public schools.

The organization and governance of private schools is significantly different from that in public schools, as you may well know. However, it may not be apparent that there is considerable diversity within the private education sector in this regard. Catholic schools, for example, are commonly governed on a parish level, with high schools directed on the basis of the diocese. Diocesan educational officers also exercise some degree of coordination and supervision over the parish grade schools as well. Two national bodies, the United Catholic Conference, which is the national coordinating agency of the American Catholic bishops, and the National Catholic Education Association, the voluntary professional organization of Catholic educators, act as central spokesmen and coordinators for all American Catholic schools.

Lutheran schools commonly are governed on a synod basis, each of which may be divided into districts. Jewish, Christian Reformed, Baptist, Episcopal, and other church-sponsored schools also have central offices to provide leadership, service, and coordination. On a voluntary basis, many of the more prestigious denominational and non-denominational schools form the National Association of Independent Schools. Finally, groups representing more than 90% of the private schools of the nation are joined in the Council for American Private Education, which acts as their voice in legislative and other national matters. About half of the states

have state units corresponding to CAPE, to represent all varieties of private schools existing within their boundaries.

It is interesting to note that very often the term "parochial" is used as a synonym for "private" or "nonpublic." This evidently stems from the fact that the majority of private schools historically have been those sponsored by Catholic or Lutheran congregations. This term is becoming increasingly inaccurate as a general term, since many church schools are interparish or regional in nature, especially on the secondary level. It should be remembered that Catholic schools owned and operated by religious orders are outside of parish sponsorship also, as would be the case with most Episcopal, Jewish, and non-denominational schools.

The private school community in America is characterized by great diversity and decentralization. Nowhere in education is pluralism so evident as in the somewhat bewildering array of private schools. Central offices, when they exist, as on the diocesan or district level, are minimally staffed and commonly can do little more than coordinate. As superintendent of the 125 grade and high schools in St. Paul and Minneapolis, I felt that I could only smile benignly over this group of 125 independent entities who financed, staffed, and generally governed themselves.

This leads me to information on the status of boards of education in private schools. They have been recent in origin, except in the more elite academies, which have always been governed by boards of trustees similar to those on the college level. It is fair to say that, today, the great majority of private schools have a board of education for each building, composed principally of the parents of children attending that school. These boards may have greater or less degrees of authority, but more and more they are the directing and decision-making force for the school. In the Catholic sector, for example, only a small minority of

schools are still governed in the traditional manner, where the pastor and the superior of the religious order make the crucial decisions. Catholic boards are still subject to the veto power of Church authorities in a technical sense, but practically speaking, they are the power which guides the school.

Of special interest to public school administrators and clients is the financing structure of private schools. As you can see by the accompanying transparencies, the common sources for support of the typical church-related grade school are parish offerings, tuition, and fund-raising. Current federal and state programs for providing assistance to private school students to not furnish cash support for the school; they provide materials and services which are paid for by the public schools, with no money flowing through private school accounts. These services, while significant, do not fund the essential operation of the private school.

Let me show you the proportion in which the various income sources fund the private schools.

A final word in this description of the private school sector has to do with the character of the population they service. It is a common stereotype that private schools serve the rich and the elite. This is objectionable to us in private education because it just is not true; if it were, most of us would not remain in the system. The common school systems under church sponsorship (Catholic, Lutheran, Christian, etc.) are closer in population and spirit to American public schools than they are to the well-known prep schools and academies which often pre-empt the private school label in the minds of many. Note in the handout from the American Council for Private Education how the income range of private school families is moderate indeed, and how there are significant numbers of minority students, even though minorities do not commonly belong to the church bodies which sponsor the greatest number of schools.

In summary, one can characterize the private school community in America at this time as a diverse, decentralized, extensive group of schools, found all throughout the nation, usually religiously-affiliated, displaying religious symbols, and incorporating overt religious instruction and worship in the school program. These characteristics are the principal ones which distinguish these schools from those in the public school sector.

IV.

I would like to begin the body of my presentation with the most positive aspect of my subject today: collaboration between public and private educators. We in nonpublic education are for kids - for citizenship - for culture - for career preparation - for full growth and maturity on the part of all our youth - and so are you! I fail to see why we cannot regard ourselves as in a common cause for whatever advances education and against whatever may hinder such.

Sometimes public and private schools have the same students or are simultaneously concerned with them. This happens, of course, in the case of transfers between the two systems. As pupils come and go to and from public or private schools, surely the communications and arrangements can be handled with courtesy and consideration on the part of all. Delays and obstructions only harm the young people. I know that the practice in the past on the part of many private schools has been to withhold records until all financial accounts have been paid, and that this has not contributed to good feeling. However, my recollections as a private school principal have included the persistent impression that students who leave school before graduation are among those most apt to have unpaid accounts; since tuition is the greatest source of support for these schools, this can be a serious problem. However, I believe that most schools have

abandoned this practice under legal pressure, and I would hope that such a method would not be used, since it does impede the proper placement of a student in his or her new school.

One of my memories from my days in a parochial school was the shared time arrangement at the local public school, by which we participated in band at that location as 7th and 8th graders. It was a good opportunity for us to have a cultural advantage that we otherwise would not have had. Shared time arrangements permit private schools to offer a richer curriculum and activity offering than otherwise could be afforded, and I believe that it works to the advantage of public education in making districts eligible for additional state aid and helps to give teachers employment. It also makes for mixing between the pupils of the two systems and should engender the support of private school parents for public school concerns. We must be realistic, though, in admitting that shared time takes administrators' time, and there are often real problems in scheduling and transportation. I hear private school parents object because they feel that they have selected a school with a distinctive atmosphere and philosophy and would like their child to remain in that school for the entire day. Where shared time is going on, it seems to be successful, thanks to the diplomacy, tact, and patience used by administrators and faculty in working out the necessary details. I would hope that it will continue to include extracurriculars.

Collaboration in many states today includes provision for busing of nonpublic school students, often on the same buses with public school children. Here is another occasion where mature and friendly cooperation is usually the order of the day, in matters of schedules, bus routes, discipline, and other related details.

Many public and private school educators have been thrown "into each other's arms" in recent years by government programs which mandate that services be given to children in nonpublic schools. I will not go into the rationale at this time, but rather deal with the matter from the standpoint that these programs are established facts to be dealt with. On the federal level, planning and collaboration is the order of the day for programs provided by ESEA, ESAA, Public Law 94-142, energy legislation, and education of the Indo-Chinese refugees, among others. Many states provide for busing, as I have mentioned, textbooks and materials, health services, additional special education, and other pupil benefit programs.

Collaboration in regard to these government services implies the expectation that public school administrators will make them available as provided by law, strive to make them convenient (as is done with mobile units, for example, when services may not be provided in the private school itself). Above all, there should be a sincere effort to communicate and consult throughout the process of planning and implementation. Private school officials should be careful to maintain records as required, keep themselves informed, and make an effort to be reasonable in their requests and expectations.

I can attest from experience as school superintendent in the Twin Cities that collaboration on the local level with regard to student transfers and the participation of private school children in programs of government-financed services and materials seems generally to be going well. Excellent local relationships have sprung up, and I heard many a principal attest to the courtesy and helpfulness of public school personnnel in dealing with them. I also made an effort as superintendent to maintain regular contact with the superintendents of the principal public systems in which our Catholic schools were located, e.g., Minneapolis and St. Paul.

We met regularly to go over mutual concerns and problem areas which were appearing, and I found it very helpful. Collaboration in as many areas as possible was my aim.

V.

Now, how about co-existence, hopefully a peaceful sort? This was usually the pattern of the past, when there were plenty of kids to go around. We didn't worry public school leaders at that time; you were all so busy providing for constantly expanding enrollments. We didn't need help - at least not so badly. I recall my good dad saying emphatically that he would never want government aid for private education; they should keep their hands off private schools, he affirmed. But that was when private schools were competing with public schools generally financed from only one source - local taxes. Now public education is paid for by three levels of government, and it is no longer true, as my father affirmed at that time, that the support of the local parochial schools had a direct effect on decreasing the amount to be paid in local taxes; the connection was plainly evident at that time. Anyway, there was not this so-called competition for public funds, so each system went its own way.

In curriculum, I would say that we co-exist. Except for the religious element present in church-related schools, we are all heading for common goals, be they the Phi Delta Kappa list or the old seven cardinal principles or some variations thereof. We may now be using the same textbooks and materials, and even having inservice together, but there is little or no problem in having both systems of schools pursuing their instructional ways separately.

Funding of the schools presents more of a problem, even though the sources are distinct: public taxes as opposed to private, voluntary resources. Each kind of school is trying mightily to tap its own pump,

but certainly the truce is uneasy and, in fact, has broken out into what might be termed "open warfare" with regard to the organized opposition of most public school educational groups regarding aid to private schools, their parents, or their students. Increasingly also, aggressive public educators have been pursuing private money sources, so competition for the private dollar is also emerging.

VI.

I note that, when trying to deal with so-called peaceful areas of co-existence above, we also spoke of areas of competition in almost every instance, and this where real or potential conflict comes in. "Ay, there's the rub!"

Crucial areas of competition are enrollment and finances. There are also sources of tension in teacher salaries (which is apt to be one-sided inasmuch as the compensation of private school teachers rarely causes envy in the eyes of public school faculty members). Test results are sometimes a trouble-spot, especially where administrators unwisely publish them in a comparative framework. Athletics can be explosive, as we learned in St. Paul in recent years when the Catholic high schools were admitted into the public school city league - when a private school wins, coaches mutter about recruiting, scholarships, and the like.

In the last three decades, it has been possible for educators on one side or the other to exploit the bad press that their public or private counterparts were receiving. In the 60's and early 70's, Catholic schools were the whipping boys, and many headlines proclaimed closings, drop in enrollment, and financial crises. In the late 70's, now the "School Yard Blues" are being sung by the media for the public schools as they recount shrinking enrollments, the violence in the schools, closing of buildings, strikes, and school system bankruptcies. (I hope private educators are not looking smug.)

There is always the question of status that can divide public and private school adherents. Whether it is elaborate buildings and abundant equipment in the public schools, or the prestige that often attaches to certain kinds of private education, an "uplifted nose" can separate educators who should be united in a common pursuit.

Back to our principal trouble spots: enrollment and finance. The dramatic drop in the birthrate is the cause of shrinking enrollment, as is so evident. It should also be noted that the fact of a smaller number of children per family makes it possible for more families to finance a private school alternative if they do desire; this can compound public school enrollment difficulties.

Financial problems are on both sides. Shrinking enrollments and higher teacher salaries cause public school boards to have money nightmares, as do inflation and the energy crisis. The latter elements weigh heavily on private education also, both in the costs of schooling and, more importantly, in the ability of parents to meet tuition costs. So we have competition for the dollar.

Other elements causing tension between the schools are, in my opinion, the religious revival taking place in many quarters, which often embodies a militant anti-secularism, anti-humanism quality. Prevalent societal moral codes (or the lack thereof) impel conscientious parents to choose "counter-cultural" schools where - at worst - they would want their children to be insulated against current mores - or - better - where they would have them exposed to a curriculum which integrates and stresses religious norms and attitudes.

There is another, even more delicate, issue. Are private schools a haven from racial integration? They can be - and often are - it must be admitted. Public school proponents rightly resent that the burden of

combating racism rests only on their shoulders, but I think it must be remembered that the vast majority of the private schools of the nation subscribe to the anti-discrimination requirements of the Civil Rights Act and strive with all the moral force at their command to inculcate principles of acceptance and tolerance. Major church school systems have, in areas where court-ordered busing has begun, issued strict guidelines to local administrators to refuse admission to parents who seek to enroll students to avoid busing or other forms of enforced integration. This is not a simple problem.

Shall we tackle "the big one?" I am speaking competition for government funds. Let me see if I can summarize the viewpoints.

If I read the argumentation of educational groups (including AASA) who publicly and officially oppose some or all forms of government aid to nonpublic education, I hear them say that the separation of church and state must be strictly adhered to, and therefore it is unconstitutional to aid private education, most of which is under religious auspices. There is also a strong conviction expressed that government schools are most conducive to maintaining a strong democratic society. It is stated that public aid in substantial forms to private education would destroy our American public school system, or, at least, leave only the so-called dregs of society's children for them to educate. Public aid would generally lower educational standards, it is affirmed, because it would facilitate the opening of numerous splinter schools, often of low academic quality. Likewise, public aid would lead to an increase in segregation because different groups of people would tend to isolate themselves by beginning or continuing schools serving their own kind. Finally, and I believe that this is the operational argument in the minds of most opponents of public aid to private education today, such aid would lessen the amount of public funds available for public schools.

I have tried to outline briefly the arguments, as I have heard them, against aid to private schools and to their parents and students. Now permit me to outline the beliefs of private school adherents, again as I have heard or read of them - and believe me, I have been exposed to these in many forms for many years!

Aid proponents believe that the first amendment has been misinterpreted to build the wall of separation; it really does not forbid all aid to religion, but rather aid to a specific religion in preference to others. Aid to private schools takes the form of aid to parents, not to a church. Even church schools render a public service, since they provide quality human education for living and for citizenship, and the constitution, if properly read, does not forbid reimbursement for such public service.

It is also averred that private schools preserve pluralism in our nation; they provide for private choice in the important field of human development; they produce good citizens in a land which has treasured diversity. They challenge the assumption that parents should not have a choice, should not be protected from making mistakes, that a practical monopoly in education on the part of the public schools is a good thing, although we abhor monopolies in other areas of our national life. Private school adherents come back to the thesis of parent choice as a primary factor to be considered, although they certainly admit to reasonable regulation on the part of the state over the educational process. They also say that they are doing everything possible to open their schools to all who come, regardless of race or ethnic origin.

In summary, I think that it is fair to say that common positions opposing state aid to private education are based on arguments of constitutional law, on the quality of education, on desegreation, against elitism, and on limited funding available for education. Private school

aid proponents emphasize the right of parent choice in education, freedom of religion, the need for pluralism, and what they consider to be the basic rights of citizens to share in the tax dollars spent for important services.

I think it is significant to cite a number of well-known authors on the matter of aid to private schools. Recent issues of the School Board Journal and the Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals have reviewed the important book by Coons and Sugarman (authors of the California referendum movement on vouchers) entitled, Education by Choice. There have also been, in the September, 1979, Phi Delta Kappan, the voucher debate of Coons and Butts, the article by Donald Erickson on the Canadian experience in funding private education, and the piece by James Peterson, "What's It Like in a Private School?"

Less well-known is the article by Thomas Vitullo-Martin in the December, 1978, issue of The City Almanac of New York, in which he presents the results of research showing that private schools have been keeping the middle class in the city of New York. The January, 1979, issue of the Harvard Law Review tried to analyze the situation when voluntarism, neutrality, and separation principles get in each other's way in an article entitled, "Government Neutrality and Separation of Church and State: Tuition Tax Credits." Finally, the Brigham Young University Law Review, in 1978, tackled the difficult issue of secularism as a religion in speaking of "Conscientious Objection to Public Education."

Personally, I found the quote used by our own Governor Quie of Minnesota, when in the House of Representatives, in speaking to a conference sponsored by the Council for American Private Education and the U.S. Office of Education in 1976, most applicable. This is from Chief Justice Burger's dissent in the Meak vs. Pittenger case, which struck down certain auxiliary services programs for nonpublic school children:

"One can only hope that, at some future date, the Court will come to a more enlightened and tolerant view of the First Amendment's guarantee of free exercise of religion, thus eliminating the denial of equal protection to children in church-sponsored schools, and take a more realistic view that carefully limited aid to children is not a step toward establishing a state religion -- at least while this Court sits."

That is a strong statement for aid to private eudcation. Hopefully, we all can approach this tangled and controversial matter with an open mind - although I realize that it is difficult. As a good friend of mine in the Minnesota State Department of Education observed to me recently: "I'll take any one of your private schools administrators - make him a public school administrator for a month - and he will automatically oppose aid to private schools." I would hope that such reflex reactions are not the case.

VI.

What can we do about all this - as public and private school educators? I have an "easy" solution: merely - increase cooperation, smooth out our co-existence, and decrease the competition! Obviously, it will not be that easy. But let me try with some suggestions:

Would it help if we in the private schools would?

1. publicly support public schools and urge our people to do the same, especially when bond issues are at stake?
2. be very careful not to label public schools as "godless", "secular," etc.
3. be sure that we take our share of responsiblity for society's problems? (I recall a sign last fall which greeted the walkers and joggers in a marathon for nonpublic education which appealed, "Don't desert the public schools; we need your energy and your talents!").

4. try to convince our fellow citizens rationally of our position and of the case for public aid, with positive reasons - not scare tactics.
5. foster joint meetings and plannings, such as Joint Public-Private Councils, and joint efforts, such as the calendar I have in my hand which was published by the League of Women Voters in Shakopee, a small Minnesota community outside the Twin Cities, in which both school systems are featured.
6. avoid any appearance of elitism, even though some schools may be academically selective and geared to college preparation.

And, on the public school side, perhaps it would help if you would:

1. refrain from labeling with terms like "undemocratice," "elite," "parochial," "Catholic" when referring to private education.
2. not infer a blanket or official attitude from individual statements of people connected with private schools.
3. not blame private school proponents for wanting the end of the public schools.
4. not blame the clergy, especially that of the Catholic Church, for public school woes.
5. disassociate yourself from the radical elements in the anti-aid establishment, such as Madelyn Murray O'Hare, the AOAU, PEARL in New York.
6. show ingenuity in arrangements for released time, shared time, government services to private school children.
7. try to know the private schools and their personnel in your area.

8. Possibly work to have your organizations serve all schools.

In regard to this last point, I think that AASA has made real progress recently in an honest attempt to include the interests and the wishes of minority members, a classification which includes non-public educators. This is due to the response of the officers, and of the executive director, Dr. Salmon, especially, to recommendations of nonpublic administrators. Your leaders seem honestly desirous of living up to the provisions of the bylaws, which do not specify classes of members according to the public or nonpublic nature of the institution in which they serve. Nonpublic educators have been invited to serve on the influential Resolutions Committee, and there is serious consideration being given to a special standing committee to deal with nonpublic concerns, as is the case in other national educational organizations.

Specific AASA resolutions (#12 and #55) recognize the contribution being given to American society by nonpublic schools and advocate that continued effort be expended to insure cooperation and mutual respect between the two systems, even in the face of tensions caused by the factors I have previously mentioned. The association approves auxiliary services for children in nonpublic schools, but officially is opposed to substantive aid to parents such as would be given through tax credits or vouchers.

My final recommendation is an obvious one: COMMUNICATE!!! If we provide for a regular flow of printed information between the two systems, especially between central offices and between principals and appropriate district personnel, we will keep each other in mind and be generally informed of what the other is doing. Better still, there should also be a regular timetable of personal contacts, e.g., luncheons, so that human

relationships can be fostered. There should also be a mechanism for instant communication between key personnel when emergency issues come up.

VII.

In conclusion, let us come back to kids! If all of us could only forget budgets, unions, tenure, our tax base, legal directives and restrictions, human jealousy and competition, and just work cooperatively for the growth and maturity of the mysterious beings who are the young people in our charge. We could each in our own way meet the challenge of Abraham Heschel, to:

> ". . .convey to the student a sense of the marvel and the mystery of being alive, a sense of indebtedness as well as a sense of significant being, an awareness of the holiness of time, the capacity for celebration, the ability to hold God and man in one thought at one time, at all times."

both public and private schools would be doing their task, fulfilling their charge, carrying out their mission. And they <u>will</u> do it by cultivating a mindset of openness, courtesy, cooperation, mutual respect, and truly professional zeal. Such will go a long way to increase cooperation, smooth and enrich co-existence, and even eliminate competition! -- What more do we want?

Brother Theodore Drahmann, FSC
Coordinator
Nonpublic School Administration
College of St. Thomas
St. Paul, MN

cape
COUNCIL FOR AMERICAN PRIVATE EDUCATION
1625 Eye Street, N.W..Washington, D.C. 20006

PRIVATE SCHOOLS: BASIC INFORMATION
March 1, 1978

(202) 659-3236
Dr. Robert L. Lamborn
Executive Director

1. Number of private elementary and secondary schools(1)--17,950 (16.8% of all schools)

2. Number of teachers (K-12) in private schools(2)--245,000 (10.1% of all teachers)

3. Number of students (K-12) in private schools(3)--4,804,000 (9.8% of all students)

4. Annual operating expenditures in private schools(4)--7.8 billion (10.8% of total for elementary and secondary education)

5. Capital outlay in private schools(4)--.8 billion (11.2% of total for elementary and secondary education)

6. Annual income of families having children in private schools(5)

Under $5,000	3.9%		5% under	$5,500
$5,000 - 9,999	13.0%		10% under	$7,400
$10,000 - 14,999	25.7%	OR	25% under	$11,600
$15,000 - 19,999	18.3%		50% under	$17,100
$20,000 - 24,999	13.9%		75% under	$25,200
And over $25,000	17.3%			

7. Distribution of private school students by race(3)--white 4,407,000 (91.7%), black 306,000 (6.4%), other 91,000 (1.9%). CAPE's 14 member organizations, which serve approximately 15,000 private schools enrolling nearly 4.2 million students (approximately 90 percent of all private school students), subscribe to a policy of student admissions "without regard to race, color, or national origin" and have actively pursued that policy within their schools and in the courts.

8. Distribution of private school children by church affiliation(6)

Baptist	87,917 (2.1%)	Lutheran	201,257 (4.8%)
Calvinist	47,129 (1.1%)	Roman Catholic	3,110,972 (73.5%)
Episcopal	73,774 (1.7%)	Seventh-day Adventist	46,998 (1.1%)
Jewish	59,810 (1.4%)	Other	130,412 (3.1%)
		Not Affiliated	475,901 (11.2%)

Council members: The American Lutheran Church • American Montessori Society • Association of Military Colleges and Schools of the U S • Friends Council on Education • Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod • National Association of Episcopal Schools • National Association of Independent Schools • National Association of Private Schools for Exceptional Children • National Catholic Educational Association • National Society for Hebrew Day Schools • [illegible]al Union of Christian Schools • Seventh-day Adventist Board of Education, K-12 • Solomon Schechter Day School Association • U S. Ca[illegible]Conference. Associated state organizations in Arizona, California, Georgia, Kansas, Maryland, New Mexico, Oregon, Puerto Rico, [illegible], Washington, and Wisconsin

9. Private school enrollments as compared with full-time student enrollments in four-year colleges and universities[7]--almost three times the enrollment (295.2%) in private institutions; almost one and a half times the enrollment (142.4%) in public institutions; virtually equal to the combined enrollments (96%) in public and private institutions.

10. Private school enrollments as compared with enrollments in public schools[8,9]--more students than in any single state system (California - 4,613,012); more students than in the nineteen smallest state systems combined (4,550,652); and about as many students as in the 28 Great City school systems combined (4,868,832).

This information is the best available, but since it is drawn from a number of sources and relates to different school years it should be understood that it will not "check" from item to item.

References

(1) Nonpublic School Statistics, 1976-1977 (Advance Report), National Center for Education Statistics.

(2) HEW News Release (9/2/77).

(3) Current Population Reports, Population Characteristics - "School Enrollment--Social and Economic Characteristics of Students": October 1976, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

(4) The Condition of Education 1977. National Center for Education Statistics.

(5) Current Population Reports, Population Characteristics - "School Enrollment--Social and Economic Characteristics of Students": October 1975, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

(6) Nonpublic School Statistics, 1976-1977 (Advance Report), National Center for Education Statistics. This is preliminary data based only on those schools which responded to a 1976-1977 NCES Survey and is not adjusted for estimate of nonrespondents.

(7) National Center for Education Statistics. Bulletin, Advance Statistics for Management, Opening Fall Enrollment in Colleges and Universities, 1977.

(8) Education Director, Public School Systems 1976-1977. National Center for Education Statistics.

(9) Unpublished data, Fall 1976, The Council of the Great City Schools.

With the support and cooperation of the Council for American Private Education and the National Catholic Educational Association, the National Center for Education Statistics surveyed all private schools know to exist during school years 1976-77, 1977-78, and 1978-79 to acquire data on enrollments, staffing, and finances. This bulletin summarizes selected data resulting from these surveys and compares these data to public school data that the Center collects. A more comprehensive statistical report with a complete technical appendix will be issured later this year.

Data in the tables that follow are aggregated by type of school, not by level of instruction. Thus, data reported under the combined (elementary and secondary) school and "other" school categories cannot be disaggregated to level of instruction. Those data reported under elementary or secondary school categories do not represent totals for the elementary and secondary levels of instruction.

PUBLIC-PRIVATE SCHOOL COMPARISONS

This section includes a number of comparisons of pupil, teacher, and finance data from public and private schools.

The number of schools decreased

Table 1.--Number and percent distribution of public and private schools: United States, School years 1976-77 through 1978-79

School Year	Total	Total		Elementary		Secondary		Combined		Other	
		Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
1976-77											
(No.)	108,681	88,597	20,084	61,704	12,965	23,206	2,484	1,538	3,422	2,149	1,213
(%)	100.0	81.5	18.5	56.8	11.9	21.4	2.3	1.4	3.2	2.0	1.1
1977-78											
(No.)	108,063	88,025	20,038	61,123	12,915	23,222	2,462	1,521	3,451	2,159	1,210
(%)	100.0	81.5	18.5	56.6	11.9	21.5	2.3	1.4	3.2	2.0	1.1
1978-79											
(No.)	107,033	87,365	19,668	61,843	12,750	20,559	2,418	2,526	3,352	2,437	1,148
(%)	100.0	81.6	18.4	57.8	11.9	19.2	2.3	2.4	3.1	2.3	1.1

Between October 1, 1976, and October 1, 1978, the total number of schools decreased by 1.5 percent; the number of public schools decreasing by 1.4 percent and private schools by 2.1 percent. For each of the three years the relative proportions of public and private schools remained more or less constant: 81.5 percent of the schools were public and 18.5 percent were private.

During this period the proportion of public schools by type of school changed. The number of public secondary schools decreased by 11.4 percent, while the numbers of elementary, combined, and other schools increased by 2.3, 64.2, and 13.4 percent respectively. Such marked changes were not observed among the private schools. The number of private schools in each category decreased slightly, but the proportions remained relatively constant.

CATHOLIC SCHOOL INCOME

ELEMENTARY:	TUITION	23 %
	PARISH	60
	DIOCESE	2
	FUND-RAISING	3
	OTHER	1
	RELIGIOUS	11
		100 %

SECONDARY:	TUITION	75 %
	(DIOCESE)	(4 %)
	FUND-RAISING	8 %
	OTHER	7
	RELIGIOUS	10
		100 %

CATHOLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS 1950 TO 1980

ST.PAUL-MPLS. ARCHDIOCESE

	1950	1963	1975	1980EST.
SCHOOLS	115EST.	156	112(122)	110(119)
STUDENTS	39,000EST.	75,385	35,260	31,500
GRADE 1 ENROLLMENT	5,150EST.	9,535	3,735	3,500-
% OF INFANT BAPTISMS ENTERING GRADE 1	65-70%	52%	25%	32%
AVERAGE TUITION/FEES 1ST CHILD-PARISHIONER	$5-10	$10-15	$155	$230+
PROFESSIONAL STAFF	985	1,925	1,750	1,650
RELIGIOUS AS PERCENT OF STAFF	95%	63%	31%	21%
PUPIL-STAFF RATIO	40	39	20	19.5
PER PUPIL COST EST.	$50-65	$100-125	$ 505	$ 750+
PUPILS PER BUILDING	339	483	289	269